

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2 \*E-FILED 8/9/07\*  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

9 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
10 CALIFORNIA,

NO. C 03 05669 JW (RS)

11 Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant,  
v.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
TO COMPEL**

12 MICRO THERAPEUTICS, INC., et al,

13 Defendants/Counterclaimants and Third  
14 Party Plaintiffs,

15 v.  
16 BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION, et al.

17  
18 Third Party Defendants.

19 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
20  
21 Plaintiff the Regents of the University of California (“UC”) moves to compel defendants  
22 (collectively “MTI”) to produce attorney billing records reflecting the attorney fees MTI has  
23 incurred in the defense of this action. UC asserts, and MTI does not contest, that MTI has identified  
24 those fees as the sole basis of MTI’s damages under its antitrust counterclaims. The Court finds this  
25 matter suitable for disposition without oral argument, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1 (b).<sup>1</sup>

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> This action has given rise to substantial discovery motion practice as well as other motions.  
28 Because the background of the case has been discussed in many prior orders, it will not be repeated  
here, and the discussion of the present issues will otherwise be abbreviated. The Court notes and

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1        MTI objects to the requested relief on the following four grounds: 1. MTI contends that the  
2 request “impermissibly intrudes” on privileged information. Although, as UC has argued, billing  
3 records are not *generally* privileged, UC has plainly stated that it does not object to MTI redacting  
4 from the billing records any privileged information that may be contained therein. Accordingly,  
5 without reaching UC’s further assertion that MTI has waived any privilege claims by putting its fees  
6 “at issue,” the Court concludes that production of the records, with such redactions as may be  
7 necessary to protect any information as to which a good-faith claim of privilege may be asserted, is  
8 appropriate.

9        2. MTI contends that its damages encompass *all* fees *actually incurred* in the defense of this  
10 action and that therefore the “reasonableness” of those fees is not at issue. While “reasonableness”  
11 of its fees may not be the precise question, inquiry into whether the fees were incurred *as a*  
12 *proximate result* of the alleged wrongdoing remains appropriate. To provide an extreme example, if  
13 MTI’s lawyers charged MTI \$100,000 for preparing a pleading that took only an hour to draft, UC  
14 would have every right to argue that the fees “actually incurred” by MTI were the result of its  
15 lawyers’ overreaching, rather than a consequence of any conduct by UC.<sup>2</sup> Thus, while the  
16 “reasonableness” of the fees incurred by MTI may not be *directly* at issue, the question of whether  
17 the fees were incurred as a proximate result of the alleged wrongdoing is largely indistinguishable  
18 from such an inquiry.

19        Additionally, as UC points out, MTI presumably has incurred fees in this action that arose  
20 from its prosecution of various counterclaims, some of which apparently have been abandoned.  
21 Without reaching the question of whether MTI ultimately may recover any such fees as damages, for  
22 purposes of discovery, UC is entitled to explore what issues were being pursued when the fees were  
23 generated.

24        3. MTI complains that UC refuses to agree to a reciprocal disclosure of its attorney billing  
25

---

26 appreciates that the parties have made efforts to resolve at least two recent issues without Court  
27 involvement. See Docket Nos. 840 and 828.

28        <sup>2</sup> The Court does *not* suggest there is any evidence in the record of overcharging by any  
counsel. The absence of such evidence, however, does not undercut UC’s right to discovery.

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

records. The simplest answer is that MTI has pointed to no discovery request it made seeking such records. More fundamentally, though, UC's fees are not equally relevant, as UC has not claimed its fees as damages.<sup>3</sup> MTI argues that the amount of fees expended by UC has some bearing on the reasonableness of MTI's fees. In this instance, however, there *is* a meaningful distinction between "reasonableness" and "proximate cause." Even assuming that the fees generated by UC's counsel in prosecuting this action might serve as some sort of yardstick as to the "reasonableness" of the defense fees, they would have virtually no bearing on whether the defense fees were incurred as a proximate result of the allegedly wrongful conduct. Thus, even assuming MTI could point to some discovery request that sought disclosure of UC's incurred fees, there would be little if any basis to compel production of those documents at this point in the litigation.

4. Finally, MTI suggests that it should not be compelled to produce billing records until and unless it prevails on its antitrust claims at trial. In the absence of any order bifurcating the trial issues, this argument is not compelling.<sup>4</sup> Even were the trial to be bifurcated, MTI has not shown that it would be reasonable to postpone completion of the discovery process until some time between the phases of the trial.

Accordingly, good cause appearing, it is hereby ordered that within 20 days of the date of this order, MTI shall produce the attorney billing records supporting its damage claim, redacted if necessary as outlined above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.  
Dated: August 9, 2007



RICHARD SEEBOORG  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>3</sup> UC's fees could become relevant post-trial, should it prevail on its infringement claims, obtain a finding that the case was "exceptional," and then bring a motion for attorney fees based on that finding. Whatever rights MTI might then have or not have to inspect the billing records of UC's counsel are not pertinent to this dispute.

<sup>4</sup> It appears that MTI may have recently filed a motion seeking such bifurcation.  
ORDER  
C 03 05669 JW (RS)

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT NOTICE OF THIS ORDER HAS BEEN GIVEN TO:**  
2 David L. Anstaett david.anstaett@hellerehrman.com  
3 Gabrielle E. Bina grina@hewm.com  
4 Wendy Lynn Bjerknes Wbjerknes@fenwick.com  
5 Henry Zuzueta Carbajal , III hcarbajal@fenwick.com, ssanford@fenwick.com  
6 Carolyn Chang cchang@fenwick.com, vschmitt@fenwick.com  
7 Chien-Ju Alice Chuang achuang@fenwick.com, dyoungman@fenwick.com  
8 Charles G. Curtis , Jr ccurtis@hewm.com  
9 J. Anthony Downs jdowns@goodwinprocter.com  
10 Julie Lynn Fieber jfieber@flk.com  
11 Rita A. Hao rita.hao@ucop.edu  
12 David J. Harth dharth@hewm.com, pdean@hewm.com, tanders@hewm.com,  
tgresl@hewm.com  
13 David Edwin Jones dejones@hewm.com  
14 Michael Francis Kelleher mkelleher@flk.com  
15 Amanda Marie Kessel akessel@goodwinprocter.com  
16 Lissa Rose Koop Lissa.Koop@Hellerehrman.com  
17 Charlene Marie Morrow cmorrow@fenwick.com  
18 Autumn Noelle Nero autumn.nero@hellerehrman.com, djmorgan@hellerhman.com  
19 Lynn Harold Pasahow lpasahow@fenwick.com, tchow@fenwick.com  
20 Nicole Elise Perroton nperroton@goodwinprocter.com, lthomas@goodwinprocter.com  
21 Michael Kenneth Plimack mplimack@hewm.com  
22 Patrick Eugene Premo ppremo@fenwick.com, mguidoux@fenwick.com  
23 Colin G. Sandercock csandercock@proskauer.com, cherron@proskauer.com  
24 Roland Schwillinski rschwillinski@goodwinprocter.com  
25 Michael Jeffrey Shuster mshuster@fenwick.com, tthomas@fenwick.com  
26 John S. Skilton jskilton@hewm.com  
27 Allison H Stiles astiles@goodwinprocter.com  
28 ORDER  
C 03 05669 JW (RS)

1 Michael G. Strapp mstrapp@goodwinprocter.com  
2 Patrick Shaun Thompson pthompson@goodwinprocter.com  
3 Michelle M. Umberger mumberger@hewm.com, zseyferth@hewm.com  
4 Sarah C. Walkenhorst swalkenhorst@hewm.com  
5 Paul F. Ware , Jr pware@goodwinprocter.com  
6  
7 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not  
8 registered for e-filing under the Court's CM/ECF program.

9 **Dated: 8/9/07**

Chambers of Judge Richard Seeborg

10 By: /s/ BAK  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER  
C 03 05669 JW (RS)